

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are currently pending in the application. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of claims 1-21. Claims 23-26, 28 and 29 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 23 and 28 have been rewritten in independent form so as to be allowable. Claims 24-26 and 29 each depend from one of these rewritten claims.

Only claims 22 and 27 stand rejected on art. Both claims stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. Re.37,590, to Leyden et al (Leyden).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 22 and 27 is requested.

Claim 22 recites, among other limitations, that the flexible cord, housing, and support are interconnected so that the cord can be turned about the length of the cord continuously in one direction without causing kinking of the cord. For clarification purposes, language has been added to describe that the cord is turned by turning the article to which the cord is attached.

The significance of this can be explained with respect to Fig. 4 of Leyden. The turning that is contemplated is turning of the sensor 35 attached to the article in such a manner that the cord extending between the pulley 46 and sensor 35 is rotated about the length thereof. In Fig. 4, this length extends from left to right.

The device depicted in Fig. 4 is one that is currently sold commercially by the applicant. There is no structure provided to prevent kinking in the event that the sensor 35 is continuously turned in one direction about the length of the cord extending from left to right in Fig. 4.

The Examiner alleges in the second full paragraph on page 3 of the Action that Leyden's double pulley arrangement avoids twisting of the cord about its length. The double pulley arrangement does not prevent kinking of the cord in the event that it is turned

around its length as described above. As seen in Fig. 4, if the sensor 35 is continuously turned in one direction, the cord between the sensor and pulley will in fact kink.

In light of this, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 22 be withdrawn.

Claim 27 depends from claim 22 and recites further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the prior art.

Entry of the amendment, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 22 and 27, and allowance of the case are requested.

Enclosed is the extra claim fee of \$100.00. Should additional fees be required in connection with this matter, please charge our deposit account No. 23-0785.

Respectfully submitted,

By



John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: April 11, 2005